

REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment with a Request for Continued Examination is in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 7, 2010.

Claims 1, 8 and 14 are hereby amended to further clarify and emphasize aspects of the invention as claimed, namely, the “platform enabling formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of said plurality of disparate telecommunication systems from the control interface and enabling monitoring of a user of the control interface.” These amendments do not add any new matter and are supported by the specification as originally filed. (See *e.g.*, specification, page 45, lines 7-13, noting an appropriate user interface to populate data; pages 16-17, noting the employee activity routine).

Accordingly, Applicants request entrance and examination regarding the same.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,850,426 to Watkins, et al. (“Watkins”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,242 to Glaser, et al. (“Glaser”).

Watkins, as understood, discusses centralized monitoring and/or control of a telephone network with a plurality of reporting computer systems that are each used to monitor and/or control at least a portion of a telephone network. (Watkins, abstract, lines 1-6) “A user can monitor and/or control the entire telephone network or any portion thereof from a single location at the centralized computer system.” (Watkins, abstract, lines 6-8)

Applicants reiterate from previous arguments that Watkins fails to teach or suggest “disparate telecommunication systems.” In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts a **single** telephone network and portions of the

single telephone network as a “reasonable” interpretation of the claimed “disparate telecommunication systems.” (Office Action, 04/07/2010, pages 7-8) Applicants assert that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have understood the single telephone network discussed in Watkins, or the portions thereof, to be disparate telecommunications systems. While it is appreciated the Examiner is tasked with interpreting claim terms as broadly as reasonably possible, here the claim language of “disparate telecommunication systems” defies reasonable inclusion of the single telephone network discussed in Watkins.

Watkins also fails to teach or suggest “formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of said plurality of disparate telecommunication systems from the control interface.” Watkins does not disclose formatting data nor require any transfer of data appropriate to each of the disparate telecommunication systems when establishing communications between the centralized system and the reporting systems. Since Watkins involves communication within a single telephone network, data between its reporting systems and centralized system are ready to accept messages, requiring only a network address to identify the intended recipients of data. (Watkins, column 4, lines 50-65) Watkins does not suggest formatting of appropriate data at least in that communication between the centralized system and the reporting systems are within the same network and use a single network protocol. (Watkins, column 4, lines 62-64) In contrast, the presently claimed invention explicitly requires formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of a plurality of disparate telecommunication systems.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Watkins and the other prior art of record fail to teach or suggest “enabling monitoring of a user of the control interface.”

Watkins discusses having a user “log-in” to permit the user at the centralized computer system to view screen data that is displayed at the reporting computer system. (Watkins, column 5, lines 1-9) The user of the centralized computer system is not monitored; rather, the user is monitoring the reporting computer systems. Glaser, at best, discusses displaying a work order log to a user and viewing “work completed” by a technician, but is silent with regards to monitoring the activity of the user viewing the work order log.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 8 and 14, and allowance of the same.

The dependent claims of the present application contain additional features that further substantially distinguish the invention of the present application over the prior art of record. Given the Applicants’ position on the patentability of the independent claims, however, it is not deemed necessary at this point to delineate such distinctions.

For at least all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections, and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants’ undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Dated: July 7, 2010

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH
THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS
FILING SYSTEM ON July 7, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth H. Ostrow
Reg. No. 37,410
Ostrow, Kaufman & Frankl, LLP
405 Lexington Avenue, 62nd Floor
New York, NY 10174
Customer No. 74685